

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/476,037	KORN R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Grigory Gurshman	2132	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Grigory Gurshman. (3) _____.

(2) Crystal D. Sayles. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 November 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9, 16 and 23-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant has proposed amendments to the independent claims 9, 16, 23-25. Examiner has agreed to consider the proposed amendments. Applicant's arguments with regard to prior art of record have been found persuasive.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



THOMAS R. PEESO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required